


[Advanced Groups Search](#) [Preferences](#) [Groups Help](#)

Groups search results 1 for

[MailMarshal 5.5](#) • Spam Filtering for Exchange, and Server 2000 Download Trial Today! • www.nwtechusa.com

Sponsored

[Links](#)
[Anti-Spam for Enterprises](#) • Spam filtering - No false positives 30 day trial - 1 hour to install • www.frontbridge.com
[Eliminate Annoying Spam](#) • Angry about lost time? Filter junk email. PC World Best Buy Award: • www.iHateSpam.net
From: [Ian Leicht \(ian@axxis.com\)](mailto:ian@axxis.com)

Subject: Re: My spamblock; Was: Thwarting UCE address culling programs.

Newsgroups: [news.admin.net-abuse.email](#),View: [Complete Thread \(11 articles\)](#)[comp.mail.sendmail](#), [comp.security.unix](#)[Original Format](#)

Date: 1997/01/26

On Wed, 22 Jan 1997 19:08:52 +1100, Julian Byrne

<Julian.Byrne@eng.monash.edu.au.DELETE_THIS> wrote:

>I think you're seriously overestimating how much the 'bot inconveniences
 >a person trying to contact me for the first time. In practice it's just
 >not that big a deal. Philosophically I think it's appropriate that the

When my mail filter rejects someone's mail, it sends them a message explaining why their mail was rejected and includes instructions on how to get a piece of mail through to me (basically they just need to use a phrase in the subject) -- even though this is pretty straightforward, it still seems to confuse people quite a bit.

>*YES!* That is one reason why I dislike conventional filtering,
 >because if it makes a mistake, and it will, mail could be lost. The

My solution to this is to put all rejected mail into a junkmail folder and keep logs of all the filters activity. If I see any mail that was rejected that doesn't seem like junk mail (ie from the subject or sender) I usually take a look at it

>kooks, to contact you. They all have equivalent technical resources.
 >*Anything* an average netizen can do a spammer can do better, because
 >they have a financial incentive to do so. It's only when you start
 >'charging' them something, in this case person time/contact, will the
 >spammer lose that financial incentive.

I disagree with this. Most of the spammers don't know much about the internet at all. They have purchased some sort of spam generating product sold by some of the few people that are competent. Right now at least, we can evolve considerably faster than the spammers.

A strategy that I think would be very effective in overcoming spamming without using the "caller ID" approach is to establish a "trust web". Since it takes a finite amount of time for spam to propagate through across the net, if someone in the first 10,000 is able to file an alert at a trust node, this could automagically alert the other members mail filters to reject the mail when it comes to them. Suggestions? Comments?

>

>Julian Byrne <<http://kryten.eng.monash.edu.au/gspam.html>>

>
>(Apologies for the delayed reply - the US-Australian newsfeed is slooow)

-----+-----
Ian Leicht | Netizens Against Gratuitous Spamming
Personal: ian@axxis.com | URL: <http://axxis.com/~ian/nags/>
| Evolution: love it or leave it

[Google Home](#) - [Advertise with Us](#) - [Business Solutions](#) - [Services & Tools](#) - [Jobs, Press, & Help](#)

©2003 Google